Harold Weisberg
Rt. 8, Frederick, Md. 21701
2/7/74

Dear Mr. Rather,

Although I have spent 10 years looking into and writing about the JFK assassination, I avoided writing you when rumors attributing opinion to you were circulating because I know you are busy. And I don't know what interest, if any, you have in that subject. I am aware of your contemporaneous reporting.

However, your broadcast of night before last on the Mullen agency interests me too much not to write because I would like any information you do not have to keep confidential about that and Hunt. I have known the essence of what you reported almost since the moment of the Watergate arrests. I have been following it in my own way, meaning where my own analysis took me and by means of the Freedom of Information law. Because of my financial limitations, this means I am going slowly. However, when I have done what I can, I will have established solidly enough for use in court the machinery for all of this.

The prejudices and the emotional and political pressures against my work are such that I do not expect to be publishable, so in recent years, before beginning writing that I must consider can be no more than the making of a record, I have attempted to interest others in what I know and develop. CBS' files and George Herman's recollection should reflect my offers of long, long ago on Watergate. What I then had took months to come out and then often did only by accident. One example of this is Nixon's looseness with public money. I have known of this for years. Specifically, I knew of San Clemente in I think 1970, not later than 1971 and I started to use the Freedom of Information law in the summer of 1972 on it. However, I feared that with my limited facilities what I could do might be irresponsible, so instead I sent leads or offered them to more than a dozen others, none of whom were interested. Not even with John Dean's signature when he was still the fair-haired.

I am well into an over-large book that is different than any other I expect to be written. Naturally, what I have exclusively I am not anxious to give away. However, if you want to carry the Mullen angle farthur, there are some aspects I would be willing to let you have. I also tell you frankly that there are some in which I have too much investment to give away. You are onto only one. I presume someone had an interest in seeing to it that what you reported was reported and thus you knew.

This is an enormously Byzantine matter, so technical and complicated that I doubt the best daily reporter is or can be equipped to fully understand what he may learn or be given. I believe it is possible that I may be able to see in these things what others cannot, not because I have some special genius but because of my previous experience, including as an investigator and in intelligence, and because of the considerable amount of work I have done in the past decade. I can illustrate this to you by the FOI suits I have filed, one of which George should remember, and in the current business of Nixon's Archives deals, where the <u>initial</u> fraudulent intent is not yet reported. If this interests you for reporting, I have the contract - and it should be considered a contract, not a deed - and precedent and laws not yet cited and similar contracts of the past in my files. The <u>first</u> requirement was <u>never</u> met, Nixon was legally able to take it <u>all</u> back, and it provided a means of suppressing what is in his files, with the government having to defend any action to obtain access. There <u>are</u> files he would want suppressed.

One element of this affair that interests me much is improper domestic activities by the spooks. I have carbons of some surveillance of me. If you or any others at CBS have anything at all on this, no matter how inconclusive, I would welcome it. I have completely established one "front" used for this.

Whoever gave you this Mullen information pointed you in the right direction. I do have much more on this but not the Singapore angle you reported. And there is much more to Mullen and much more than Mullen.

If I can help you, we are but an hour from your offices or home.

And if there is anything to which you or others at CBS can let me have access, I would, of course, appreciate it.

I have no way of knowing whether any of you have done any investigating. All the work of which I know seems to be straight reporting. It therefore seems possible to me that I may be able to be helpful where you may have leads you have not been able to follow or make sense of or where you have facts to which you are unable to attribute meaning.

Please believe me when I say there is an enormous amount that everyone has missed. No daily reporter has the time required to pick it up or even understand this. So you can understand this is not criticism, I cite an example of what I cannot give you without jeopardizing my own interests, why it is that the tapes of June 20 received such extensive memory-holing. The answer is public domain and everyone missed it. This is not because it is difficult to see. It is because of the amount of work required. I wrote what I will be saying about this months ago, before the disappearance of those tapes was even known.

Understanding this would explain much and answer questions to which there may seem to be no answers.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg